Appl. Ser. No. 10/769,156 Amendment Dated June 13, 2005 Reply to Office Action of February 11, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

• ,

Responsive to the Office Action, Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the indication of the allowability of Claims 49 and 60 through 68. Claim 50 is also believed to be allowable, since it is dependent on Claim 49.

Accordingly, Applicants have canceled Claims 45 through 68 (Claims 1 through 44 were previously canceled) and present herewith new Claims 69 through 83 which are believed to be in condition for allowance.

In particular, Claim 69 is presented in independent form and includes the recitation of canceled Claims 45, 48 and 49. Claim 50 is presented herewith in dependent form as Claim 70 depending from Claim 69.

Claim 60 is presented herewith in independent form as Claim 71 and including the recitation of canceled Claims 59 and 60.

Claim 61 is presented as Claim 72 depending from Claim 71.

Claim 62 is presented herewith in independent form as Claim 73, including the recitation of canceled Claims 59 and 62. Dependent Claims 63, 64 and 65 are presented herewith as dependent Claims 74, 75 and 76, all dependent on new Claim 73.

Claim 66 is presented herewith in independent form as Claim 77 including the recitation of Claims 59 and 66. Claims 67 and 68 are presented herewith as dependent Claims 78 and 79 depending directly and indirectly from new Claim 77.

In the Office Action the Examiner indicated in the summary sheet that Claims 50 through 59 were rejected. However, in the

Appl. Ser. No. 10/769,156 Amendment Dated June 13, 2005 Reply to Office Action of February 11, 2005

detailed action the Examiner did not specify any rejection of Claims 51 through 54. Accordingly, Applicants present with this amendment new Claims 80 through 83. Claim 80 is presented in independent form and includes the recitation of canceled Claims 45 and 51 and Claims 81 through 83 are dependent on Claim 80 and comprise canceled Claims 52, 53 and 54, respectively.

The Examiner's rejection of Claim 59 under 35 U.S.C. 112 is believed to be overcome by the recitation in the claims now presented in which the term "normal plane" has been eliminated including any possible ambiguity caused by that term.

Applicants believe this application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance of Claims 69 through 83 is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 6/13/05

Michael E. Martin Registration No. 24,821 Agent for Applicants

Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP 1601 Elm Street, Suite 3000 Dallas, Texas 75201-4761 Phone (214) 999-3000 Fax (214) 999-3623

DALLAS 1541894v1